



RECEIVED  
NOV 21 2002  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

### REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claims 1-4, 6, and 8-30 are presently pending in this application.

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent no. 5,737,054 to Chao ("Chao '054"). Claims 1-6, 8, and 9 have been rejected as unpatentable over Chao '054 in view of U.S. Patent no. 5,568,207 to Chao ("Chao '207"). Claims 1-6, 8 and 9 have been rejected as unpatentable over Chao '207 in view of Chao '054.

Also, claims 1-4, 6, and 8-30 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness type double patenting, in view of the claims of applicant's U.S. Patent no. 6,109,747 ("Chao '747") issued August 29, 2000. In fact, the present application is a continuation of the application no. 08/847,711, on which Chao '747 issued. Since the interests furthered by the judicially created obviousness type double patenting rejection are not implicated where the subject application was filed after June 8, 1995, and the subject application is related (under 35 U.S.C. § 120) to the patent/application supplying the basis for the rejection, as is the case here, it is respectfully requested that the examiner withdraw this rejection after reconsidering its applicability to the present case.

Claims 1-4, 6, and 8-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as unpatentable over Chao U.S. Patent no. 5,737,054 (Chao 054) in view of Chao U.S. Patent no. 5,568,207 (Chao 207). Claims 1-4, 6, and 8-30 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as unpatentable over Chao 207 in view of Chao 054.

It is respectfully submitted that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) are traversed. To sustain a finding of nonpatentability under section 103, an examiner must show an un rebutted *prima facie* case of obviousness. See *In re Deuel*, 51, F.3d 1552, 1557, 34 USPQ2d 1210, 1214 (Fed. Cir. 1995).

A *prima facie* case of obviousness requires showing:

- (a) the differences in the claim over the applied references,
- (b) the proposed modification of the applied references necessary to arrive at the claimed subject matter, and
- (c) an explanation why such proposed modification would be obvious. M.P.E.P. § 706.02.


The Examiner again maintains that it would have been obvious for one ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Chao '054 in view of Chao '207 (and vice versa). However, independent claims 1 and 8 recite an eyeglass combination having features that provide for the engagement of the primary frame and the auxiliary frame at the bridges and sides of the respective frames. Neither of the Chao '207 or the Chao '054 references teach or suggest this combination, and it is respectfully submitted that office action does not provide sufficient explanation of how the skilled artisan would be motivated to combine the teachings of Chao '207 with Chao'054, or vice versa. "The mere fact that a reference could be modified to produce the patented invention would not make the modification obvious unless it is suggested by the prior art."

*Libbey-Owens-Ford v. BOC Group*, 655 F. Supp., 897, 903; 4 USPQ 2d 1097, 1103 (DCNJ 1987) (Emphasis added). While it is permissible to modify a reference's disclosure in the examination of patent applications, such modifications are not allowed if

they are prompted by an applicant's disclosure, rather than by a reasoned analysis of the prior art and by suggestions provided therein. *In re Leslie*, 192 USPQ 427 (CCPA 1977).

Chao '207 teaches an arrangement as shown in the Figure 7 where in magnetic members 22 of arms 21 of auxiliary frame 20 extend over extension 11 of primary spectacle frame 10. On the other hand, Chao '054 teaches an arrangement as shown in the Figure 4 wherein connector member 24 of middle bridge portion 21 of auxiliary frame 20 extends over middle bridge portion 13 of primary spectacle frame 10. Each reference, with its own district teachings as how an auxiliary frame can be mounted to primary frame, makes no suggestion that the teachings of the references may be combined. Again, when a rejection depends on a combination of prior art references, there must be some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the references. *See In re Geiger*, 815 F. 2d 686, 688, 2 USPQ2d 1276, 1278 (Fed. Cir. 1987); *see also in re Fine*, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Since there is no apparent motivation to combine the teachings of Chao '207 with Chao '054 (or vice versa), it is submitted that the present claims are patentable over the prior art of record.

Wherefore, based upon the foregoing it is submitted that the application is in condition of allowance and a relatively early reply to this paper would be appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,  
  
Richard J. Danyko  
Registration No. 33,672

DREIER & BARITZ LLP  
Attorneys for Applicant  
499 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10022  
(212) 328-6100  
(212) 328-6114 (fax)